

Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed April 11, 2008. Claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 22, and 23 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 10, and 20 are amended respectively to incorporate subject matter from these claims. Claims 5, 6, 13, 15, 16, and 24 are amended to change dependencies. Claims 2 and 20 are amended to address informalities. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13, 15-21, and 24-37 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

I. Claim Objections

In section 1, claim 20 is objected to because of an informality. Claim 20 is amended to address the informality. Reconsideration and removal of the objection are therefore requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In sections 3 and 4, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 is amended to address the rejection. Reconsideration and allowance are therefore requested.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 6, claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 are rejected as being anticipated by Harrison (US 5,617,079). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 4 and 14 in an effort to place this application into condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 10, as well as claims 2 and 11 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In sections 8-12, the following rejections are made:

- claims 3, 6, 7, and 13 are rejected as being obvious over Harrison in view of Hetherington (US 6,077,107);

- claims 9 and 19 are rejected as being obvious over Harrison in view of Serby (US 5,444,434);
- claims 20 and 21 are rejected as being obvious over Harrison in view of Holloway (US 6,739,633);
- claims 22 and 25-27 are rejected as being obvious over Harrison in view of Holloway and further in view of Hetherington; and
- claim 28 is rejected as being obvious over Harrison in view of Holloway and further in view of Serby.

These rejections are respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, and 19 depend respectively from claims 1 and 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided above.

Claim 20 is amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claim 23 in an effort to place the application into condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 20, as well as claims 21, 22, and 25-28 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

In sections 13 and 14, claims 29-37 are noted as being allowed, and claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 23, and 24 are noted as being allowable. The Examiner's assistance in identifying allowable subject matter is appreciated. All claims are in condition for allowance.

VI. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned with any questions regarding this application.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: August 11, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/

Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No. 50,471